

REMARKS

Claims 1-50 are pending in this application. All of the pending claims were rejected. Claims 25, 32, 39, 40, and 47 are currently amended. Reconsideration is respectfully requested.

Claims 25-50 were subject to rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, and objection based on informalities. The claims have been amended in accordance with the Examiner's suggestions. Withdrawal of the rejections and objection is therefore requested.

The presently claimed invention distinguishes the combination of Byers and Dewberry because multiple copies of the signal are transmitted in different directions. The Office relies on Byers for teaching this feature. Note that in Figure 1 Byers depicts transmissions from a central hub to multiple subscribers. In the description Byers states "optical beam scanning techniques are used at the hub to rapidly move the beam from one user to the next, creating an arbitrary number of virtual point-to-point links."¹ Intuitively, one would expect those links to be utilized for transmitting different data, rather than copies of the same data, since the receivers of the data are different subscribers. Applicant is unable to locate any explicit teaching in Byers that those links transmit copies of the same data. Further, Byers characterizes the services provided on those links as "web access, work at home, VPN, video on demand, and telephony."² If the links are used to transmit copies of the same data, then every subscriber will receive the same web pages, videos on demand, and telephony, which would clearly be inappropriate. Byers therefore teaches that different data is transmitted on different links, rather than copies. by way of contrast, note that Figure 1 of this application illustrates multiple copies on multiple paths between device 2 and device 3; one direct path and one path reflected by bookcase 20. Claim 1 therefore

¹ Column 4, lines 2-5

² Column 5, lines 13-14

distinguishes Byers and Dewberry by reciting “transmitting a plurality of **copies** of the outgoing signal, at least two **copies of the outgoing signal being transmitted in different directions**, a first copy being transmitted by a first directional transmitter and a second copy being transmitted by a second directional transmitter, the first and second transmitters having non-identical transmission directions.” (emphasis added) The other independent claims recite similar distinguishing limitations. The dependent claims further distinguish the invention, and are allowable for the same reasons as their respective base claims. Withdrawal of the rejections of claims 1-50 is therefore requested.

For these reasons, and in view of the above amendments, this application is now considered to be in condition for allowance and such action is earnestly solicited. Should there remain unresolved issues that require adverse action, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner telephone Applicants' Attorney at the number listed below so that such issues may be resolved as expeditiously as possible.

Respectfully Submitted,

10/31/2006
Date

/Holmes W. Anderson/
Holmes Anderson, Reg. No. 37,272
Attorney/Agent for Applicant(s)
McGuinness & Manaras LLP
125 Nagog Park
Acton, MA 01720
(978) 264-4001

Docket No. 120-168
Dd: 11/8/2006